

**REMARKS**

The present invention relates to a display system having a digital display device operable to display an image as well as a speed detector operable to produce a speed signal indicative of the speed of the vehicle which has a window passing the display device. A vehicle detector produces a position signal indicative of the position of the vehicle relative to the display device. Processing means then connect to receive a signal from the speed detector which is indicative of the speed of the vehicle.

A signal from the vehicle detector also indicates the position of the vehicle window relative to the display device and is operable to display sequential overlapping images on the display device which are displayed in synchronism with the speed of the vehicle. An example of the overlapping images is shown in FIG. 9 of the patent drawing.

By displaying the sequential overlapping images on the display device in synchronism with the speed of the vehicle, the image viewed by a rider inside the vehicle through the window shows an essentially stationary vehicle at least with respect to the position of the rider in the vehicle. The image itself, of course, may contain moving characters.

Claims 56 and 65 form the only independent claims in the instant application. The Patent Examiner has previously rejected claims 56 and 65 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,353,468 to Howard. However, in view of the amendments made to both claims 56 and 65, Applicant respectfully submits that this basis for rejection can no longer stand and should be withdrawn.

More specifically, the Howard patent discloses an image display apparatus having a plurality of image display panels containing artwork 10 which are longitudinally spaced apart from each other along a vehicle passageway, such as a train track. As the vehicle or train comes into the area containing the artwork, strobe lights are activated in synchronism with the speed of

the train so that the artwork as viewed by a rider in the train would appear to be stationary. This, of course, requires very accurate timing of the activation of the strobe lights. Furthermore, it would seem that the appearance of the artwork through the window of the train would appear to be stationary only at relatively high speeds of the train or vehicle. At slower speeds, the display of the artwork through the window would be discontinuous at best.

In view of the amendments to claims 56 and 65, however, Applicant respectfully submits that this basis for rejection can no longer stand and should be withdrawn.

More specifically, both independent claims 56 and 65 have been amended to more clearly define that the display means displays sequentially overlapping images on the display device in synchronism with the speed of the vehicle. Since the images are overlapping, a continuous image may be viewed through the vehicle window even despite slow vehicle speeds.

In sharp contrast to the present invention as is now defined in claims 56 and 65, as well as their dependent claims, the Howard patent does not disclose a device in which sequential overlapping images are displayed on the display device in synchronism with the speed of the vehicle. Rather, in Howard the images or artwork 10 are clearly spaced from each other in a non-overlapping fashion. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify Howard so that the images were overlapping since, unlike the present invention, in Howard the images are displayed by a strobe light timed with the speed of the vehicle. Consequently, if the images were overlapping, two images would be displayed by Howard, rather than one. That, of course, would result in a completely unacceptable display system.

The Examiner's objection to the abstract has been duly noted and corrected by this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for formal allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 07-1180.

Dated: July 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Douglas W. Sprinkle/  
Douglas W. Sprinkle  
Registration No.: 27,394  
GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON  
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.  
2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330  
Post Office Box 7021  
Troy, Michigan 48007-7021  
(248) 647-6000  
(248) 647-5210 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant